	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COOLEY GODWARD LLP STEPHEN P. SWINTON (106398) JAMES DONATO (146140) PATRICK M. MALONEY (197844) 4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92121-2128 Telephone: (858) 550-6000 Facsimile: (858) 453-3555 R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR. (102178) GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED 10210 Genetic Center Drive San Diego, CA 92121-4362 Telephone: (858) 410-8918 Facsimile: (858) 410-8637 Attorneys for Plaintiff Gen-Probe Incorporated UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
J	13)	
rygos "ozoso	14	GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED,	No. 99cv2668 H (АЈВ)
	15	Plaintiff, v.	GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO VYSIS, INC.'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES
	16	VYSIS, INC.,	
	17	Defendant.	
o O	18		
	19 20	PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANT VYSIS, INC.	
	21	RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF GE	N-PROBE INCORPORATED
	22	SET NUMBER: Two (2)	
	23	Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33, Plaintiff Gen-Probe Incorporated ("Gen-	
	24	Probe") responds as follows to Defendant Vysis, Inc.'s ("defendant") second set of interrogatories:	
	25	I. GENERAL RESPONSES.	
	26	1. Gen-Probe's response to defendant's second set of interrogatories is made to the best	
	27	of Gen-Probe's present knowledge, information, and belief. Said response is at all times subject to	
	28	such additional or different information that discovery or further investigation may disclose and,	
COOLEY GODWARD LLP		229868 v1/SD	No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

229868 v1/SD 4XD801!.DOC 062000/1610

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4XD801!.DOC

062000/1610

- 2. To the extent that Gen-Probe responds to defendant's interrogatories by stating that Gen-Probe will provide information and/or documents which Gen-Probe, any other party to this litigation, or any other person or entity deems to embody material that is private, business confidential, proprietary, trade secret, or otherwise protected from disclosure pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(7), Federal Rule of Evidence 501, California Evidence Code section 1060, or California Constitution, article I, section 1, or any like or similar provision of law of any jurisdiction Gen-Probe will do so only upon the entry of an appropriate protective order against the unauthorized use or disclosure of such information.
- 3. Gen-Probe reserves all objections or other questions as to the competency, relevance, materiality, privilege or admissibility as evidence in any subsequent proceeding in or trial of this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever of Gen-Probe's responses herein and any document or thing identified or provided in response to defendant's interrogatories.
- 4. Gen-Probe reserves the right to object on any ground at any time to such other or supplemental interrogatories as defendant may at any time propound involving or relating to the subject matter of these interrogatories.

II. GENERAL OBJECTIONS.

- 1. Gen-Probe makes the following general objections, whether or not separately set forth in response to each interrogatory, to each instruction, definition, and interrogatory made in defendant's first set of interrogatories:
- 2. Gen-Probe objects generally to interrogatories 3 through 9, insofar as they seek information or production of documents protected by the attorney-client or the attorney work product privilege. Such information or documents shall not be provided in response to defendant's

- 3. Gen-Probe objects generally to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require Gen-Probe to identify in this response each or any document or other information which may relate to, reflect or otherwise refer to specified matters on the ground that such requests collectively encompass potentially thousands of pages of documents not all of which have or can be located and reviewed by counsel within the time period allowed by statute for this response. Accordingly, said request would subject Gen-Probe to unreasonable and undue annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense.
- 4. Gen-Probe objects to Definition B to the extent it defines "Gen-Probe" to include Gen-Probe's predecessors or successors; past or present divisions, subsidiaries, parents, or affiliates of any of the foregoing entities; past or present joint ventures, partnerships, or limited partnerships of which any of the foregoing entities is a joint venturer or a limited or general partner; and past or present directors, officers, employees, agents, or representatives of any of the foregoing entities. Said definition is vague and ambiguous in that it cannot be determined what is meant by the term "Gen-Probe." Said definition is also overly broad, seeks irrelevant information not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and would subject Gen-Probe and the other entities identified in the definition to unreasonable and undue annoyance, oppression, burden and expense.
- 5. Gen-Probe objects to Definition E to the extent that it defines the phrase "target capture" to the extent the definition provided is broader than any disclosure of the '338 patent.
- 6. Gen-Probe objects to the introductory statement to the extent it suggests that the interrogatories are continuing, on the ground that said instruction seeks unilaterally to impose an obligation to provide supplemental information greater than that required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e) and would subject it to unreasonable and undue annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense. Gen-Probe will comply with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and is willing to discuss mutually acceptable reciprocal obligations of defendant for continuing discovery.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 7. Gen-Probe objects to Definition B and Instruction A to the extent that they seek to require Gen-Probe to search for information, documents and information about documents no longer in existence or no longer in Gen-Probe's possession, custody or control, on the grounds that said instruction is overly broad, would subject Gen-Probe to undue annoyance, oppression, burden and expense, and seeks to impose upon Gen-Probe an obligation to investigate information or materials from third parties or services who are equally accessible to defendant.
- 8. Gen-Probe objects to Instruction A to the extent it seeks to require Gen-Probe to identify anything other than the specific claim or privilege or work product being made and the basis for such claim, on the ground that the additional information sought by defendant would subject Gen-Probe to unreasonable and undue annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense, and constitutes information protected from discovery by privilege and as work product.

III. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES.

Without waiving or limiting in any manner any of the foregoing General Objections, but rather incorporating them into each of the following responses to the extent applicable, Gen-Probe responds to the specific interrogatories in defendant's first set of interrogatories as follows:

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

State in detail each and every legal and factual basis for, and identify all documents and/or all non-written communications that refer or relate in any manner to, Gen-Probe's allegation in paragraph 35 of its First Amended Complaint that "Vysis has acted and continues to act unfairly, inequitably and in bad faith" and that "Vysis' actions constitute unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices under California Business & Professions Code Sections 17200, et. seq."

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY No. 3:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Gen-Probe further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it prematurely seeks the facts and contentions that Gen-Probe will advance at trial before the completion of investigation and discovery. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe will agree to disclose the bases upon which it asserted the allegations of paragraph 35 of the First Amended Complaint and responds as follows:

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN DIEGO

229868 v1/SD 4XD801!.DOC 062000/1610 No. 99cv2668 H (АЈВ)

Although Vysis knows or should know that the '338 patent is invalid, unenforceable and does not encompass methods or compositions used in Gen-Probe's products, Vysis in early 1999 took the position that Gen-Probe would be liable for patent infringement unless Gen-Probe took a license to the '338 patent. In early 1999, Vysis informed Gen-Probe that the '338 patent applied to Gen-Probe's nucleic acid tests for HIV and hepatitis for use in screening donated blood. Vysis continued to take this position in subsequent communications between the parties. Vysis's actions must be considered in light of the prior conduct of Vysis, its predecessors, and its affiliates toward Gen-Probe. Written communications include the letters from John Bishop of Vysis to Henry L. Nordhoff of Gen-Probe dated February 11, 1999 and February 17, 1999. Oral communications were made primarily between March 1999 and June 22, 1999 in connection with various discussions in San Diego between the parties.

In December 1999, through a letter from Peter Shearer, Gen-Probe informed Vysis of invalidating prior art. Vysis responded to Mr. Shearer's letter on January 19, 2000, professing satisfaction with the '338 patent. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Vysis continued to maintain that the patent is valid and that Gen-Probe is subject to the earlier executed license to the '338 patent.

INTERROGATORY No. 4:

Identify by name, model number, or other designation, each current and past product or process for detecting and/or quantifying a polynucleotide using target capture and amplification developed by Gen-Probe, either by itself or with another person, including but not limited to Gen-Probe NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV. For each product identified, indicate the dates during which manufacture and/or sales of the product occurred, the address locations at which manufacture and/or sales occurred, each person to whom the product was sold, any feature that is believed to distinguish the product from the claims of the '338 patent.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY No. 4:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Gen-Probe further objects that this interrogatory is vague and ambiguous with respect to the term "amplification." Gen-Probe further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it prematurely seeks the facts and contentions that Gen-Probe will No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

229868 v1/SD 4XD801!.DOC 062000/1610

4XD801!.DOC

062000/1610

advance at trial before the completion of investigation and discovery. Gen-Probe also objects that to the extent this request seeks documents relating to products other than Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV, the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe responds as follows:

No Gen-Probe product uses "target capture" or "amplification" within the meaning of those terms as used in the properly construed claims of the '338 patent. Gen-Probe understands the term "product" as used in this interrogatory to mean a product that has been the subject of a commercial sale and understands the term "product" to exclude nucleic acid tests that have been transferred for use in connection with clinical trials. Subject to all of the foregoing, Gen-Probe responds that its nucleic acid tests for the detection of HIV and hepatitis C virus ("HCV") in donated blood and blood products use a form of target capture and a form of amplification that are not disclosed or claimed in the '338 patent. Between January 1, 1999 and March 30, 2000 Gen-Probe had sold kits for the detection of HIV and HCV (in 5,000-test kits and 1,000-test kits) to Chiron Corporation, Bayer Corporation, and Chugai Diagnostic Sciences Co., Ltd. These products were manufactured at 10210 Genetic Center Drive, San Diego, California and at 10808 Willow Court, San Diego, California. Gen-Probe believes that the HIV/HCV tests are not encompassed by the properly construed claims of the '338 patent for the reasons previously set forth in response to Interrogatory No. 2.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Identify each opinion, report, study, or search results, written or oral, received by, requested by, or known to Gen-Probe relating to the validity, scope, or enforceability of one or more claims of the '338 patent or to the infringement or non-infringement of one or more claims of the '338 patent by any of the products identified in Interrogatory No. 4 including but not limited to Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY No. 5:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Gen-Probe also objects that to the extent this No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

4XD801!.DOC

062000/1610

request seeks documents relating to products other than Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV, the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe declines to respond on the grounds of the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

List separately and identify: licenses, agreements, contracts or undertakings, either foreign or domestic, entered into by Gen-Probe with third parties, including documents relating to any contemplated licenses, agreements, contracts or undertakings, either foreign or domestic, relating to each product identified in Interrogatory No. 4, including but not limited to Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Gen-Probe also objects that to the extent this request seeks documents relating to products other than Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV, the interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe responds as follows:

On June 11, 1998, Gen-Probe has entered into an agreement with Chiron Corporation relating to nucleic acid tests for use in blood screening and clinical diagnostics. Chiron subsequently assigned its rights in the clinical diagnostics portion of the agreement to Bayer Corporation

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

State in detail each factual and each legal basis for Gen-Probe contention that the '338 patent is unenforceable, including each unenforceability contention advanced by Gen-Probe in briefing on Vysis' motion for a stay of these proceedings.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and

No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

4XD801!.DOC

062000/1610

General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Gen-Probe also objects that to the extent this interrogatory seeks information relating to products other than Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for use in detecting HCV or HIV, the interrogatory is overbroad, unduly burdensome and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Gen-Probe further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it prematurely seeks the facts and contentions that Gen-Probe will advance at trial before the completion of investigation and discovery. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe will agree to disclose the bases upon which it asserted in its briefing on Vysis' motion to stay that the '338 patent is unenforceable and responds as follows:

The '338 patent is unenforceable due to Vysis's inequitable conduct in the prosecution of its applications for the patent, as follows:

The patent applicant delayed the prosecution of the applications for the method invention from the filling of the 136,920 application on December 21, 1987 through at least the issuance of the patent on May 12, 1998, a period of 10 ½ years.

In connection with the petition to revive the abandoned 07/944,505 application, the patent applicant misrepresented to the PTO that the '505 application had been *unintentionally* abandoned.

The patent applicant failed to maintain consonance with the segregation of the method and device inventions after the filing of applications 944,505 and 648,468, by amending application no. 238,080 to allege that it was a divisional of application no. 400,657.

In the December 14, 1998 Request for Certificate of Correction, the patent applicant represented to the PTO that the mistakes identified in the Request were of minor character and resulted from errors made in good faith.

In the December 14, 1998 Request for Certificate of Correction, the patent applicant representing to the PTO that the mistakes identified in the Request were first identified after the issuance of the '338 patent and that the so-called "Error 2" had "only recently" been identified, when in fact Error 2 had been identified in 1995 and an amendment requested on March 8, 1995 in the course of the prosecution of application 08/400,657.

In the December 14, 1998 Request for Certificate of Correction, the patent applicant

No. 99ev2668 H (AJB)

represented to the PTO that the failure to respond to the November 5, 1992 Office Action concerning the '505 application had been inadvertent and that the '505 application had been unintentionally abandoned.

The patent applicant failed to maintain consonance with the segregation of the method and device inventions after the filing of applications 944,505 and 648,468, by changing the priority claim of the '338 patent to assert that the '080 application was a continuation of application no. 124,826.

In the December 14, 1998 Petitions Requesting Entry of Amendment To Abandoned Applications, the patent applicant represented to the PTO that Sampson v. Commissioner, 195 U.S.P.Q. 136 (D.D.C. 1976), supported the amendments sought in the Petitions.

The patent applicant filed the reissue application in March 2000 without advising the PTO of the prior post-issuance amendments and corrections to the '338 patent sought in December 1998 and entered thereafter.

The patent applicant failed to advise the PTO that the term "amplify" as used in the applications for the '338 patent (and the corresponding reissue application), properly construed, did not include target specific amplification.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Identify all persons with knowledge of any of the facts listed in Gen-Probe's responses to Vysis' interrogatory Nos. 1-7.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe responds as follows:

Peter Shearer; Christine Gritzmacher; Dan Kacian; William Bowen; Henry L. Nordhoff; John Bishop; Norval Galloway, Anthony Janiuk; Charles E. Lipsey; Thomas Ryan; Hon. Ronald Prager; Thomas Banks; Mark Collins; Donald Halbert; Walter King; Jonathan Lawrie; Scott Decker; Sherrol McDonough; Martha Bott; Sharon Bodrug.

COOLEY GOOWARD LLP 229868 v1/SD
ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO 062000/1610

No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

State in detail each factual and each legal basis, other than non-infringement of the '338 patent by Gen-Probe's NAT test kits for detecting HCV or HIV, invalidity of the '338 patent, or unenforceability of the '338 patent, for the statement in paragraph 22 of Gen-Probe's First Amended Complaint for Declaratory Relief and Unfair Competition that "Gen-Probe contends that it has no obligation to make any royalty payments to Vysis with respect to its present products and activities and any contemplated products and activities," if Gen-Probe contends other bases exist.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

Gen-Probe incorporates into this response each of the foregoing General Responses and General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Gen-Probe further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks prematurely, before the completion of investigation and discovery, the facts and contentions that Gen-Probe will advance at trial. Without waiving, and subject to, the foregoing objections, Gen-Probe will agree to disclose the bases upon which it asserted the allegations of paragraph 22 of the First Amended Complaint and responds as follows:

At this time, Gen-Probe does not contend that it has no obligation to make any royalty payments to Vysis with respect to its present products and activities and any contemplated products and activities on any basis other than invalidity, unenforceability, and the fact that Gen-Probe's products are not encompassed by the properly construed claims of the '338 patent

Dated: June 20, 2000

COOLEY GODWARD LLP STEPHEN P. SWINTON (106398) JAMES DONATO (146140) PATRICK M. MALONEY (197844)

GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR. (102178)

Stenhen P. Swinton

Attorneys for Plaintiff Gen-Probe Incorporated

27 28

COOLEY GODWARD LLF 22986:
ATTORNEYS AT LAW 4XD8:
SAN DIEGO 06200

229868 v1/SD 4XD801!.DOC 062000/1610 No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)